

REMARKS

In his June 9, 2004, Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-7 and 9-14 as unpatentable over Sevcik, Klatt, and Perkowski.

In an effort to overcome the rejections, Applicant has cancelled claims 1-7 and 9-14 in favor of new claims 15-24. The new claims are entirely supported by the existing disclosure, so no new matter has been added. Particular attention is directed to page 14, lines 5-13 (relating to maintenance of an audit record of user profile additions and modifications); page 14, lines 19-24 (relating to a PDF preview function); page 15, line 5- page 16, line 7 (relating to hierarchical system in which different levels of personnel are given different amounts of editorial control over the user-indicative and institution-indicative content of the print products); page 17, lines 11-19 (relating to bar code function); and page 19, lines 6-23 (relating to audit record review and print approval functions).

It is believed that the new claims patentably define over the combination of the cited references because none of the cited references, singly or in combination, teach or suggest an institutional print order processing system that provides different groups of institutional agents with different levels of editorial control over the content of printed products through separate internet-accessible interfaces.¹ It is noted that each of the new claims recites a requestor interface for selecting and ordering print products, where the requestor interface identifies a user profile, if one exists, that corresponds with the identified user; enables the user to order a print product from said set of print products for which said format-specifying templates for said institution have been defined; and generates a previewable or prepress representation of the ordered print product that populates the graphical and textual elements of the template associated with the ordered print product with individual-indicative content extracted from the requestor interface user's user profile and institution-indicative content extracted from an associated institutional profile. Each of the new claims also recites a separate profile maintenance interface that enables a user of the profile maintenance interface to define and modify institutional profiles to provide institution-indicative content for the format-specifying templates. None of the cited references, singly or in combination, teach or suggest this unique combination.

It is respectfully submitted that the distinctions between the invention, as currently claimed, and the cited references are novel, nonobvious, and patent-worthy when viewed not from hindsight, but from the perspective of one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made.

CONCLUSION

Having addressed all matters raised by the Examiner's June 9, 2004, Office Action, Applicants respectfully request that the claims be allowed.

¹ The arguments made with respect to Sevcik are incorporated by reference from the previous response.

Appl. No. 09/825,734
Amdt. dated July 22, 2004
Reply to Office Action of June 9, 2004.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 7-22-04



Charles W. Hanor
Registration No. 27132
Phone: (210) 558-9500
Fax: (210) 558-9509
e-mail: chanor@hanor.com

Please forward all future correspondence to:

Charles W. Hanor
Charles W. Hanor, P.C.
PO Box 91319
San Antonio, TX 78209

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS